UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,751	04/08/2005	Jun Hagihara	Q87381	7326
65565 SUGHRUE-265	7590 11/18/201 5 550	0	EXAMINER	
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVE. NW N, DC 20037-3213	PATTON, SPENCER D		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037-3213		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3664	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/18/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

SUGHRUE265550@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/530,751	HAGIHARA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	SPENCER PATTON	3664	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second con	sideration and/or search (see NOTw); er form for appeal by materially red	TE below);	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (l	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5 and 6. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/KHOI TRAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3664	/SPENCER PATTON/ Examiner, Art Unit 3664		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues, on pages 14-18 with respect to the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 1-3, that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that "In order to correspond to the case in which a command cannot be differentiated (for example, a step command), therefore, the filter order N is to be 4 or more (paragraph [0030])" is a showing that "N = (The order of denominator of the transfer function = 4) - (the minimum value of the order of the command = 0) = 4." The cited portion of the specification makes no mention of this equation for arriving at N and provides no indication of how N was arrived at. The specification only provides a theoretical value of N.

Applicant also argues that paragraph [0055] indicates that "N is equal to or greater than a value defined by subtracting an order (2nd-order, since the command is 2-order differentiable in this embodiment) of the command from L (4th-order)." However this paragraph only indicates theoretical values without indicating how the values were arrived at.

Applicant argues, on pages 18-20 with respect to the N-order filter processing section, Arithmetic unit, "N is equal to or greater...", and claim 3, that there are differences between the teachings of Yamamoto and the present invention. However these differences are not in the claims.

Applicant argues, on page 20 with respect to claim 2, that the speed control part 3 of Yamamoto does not correspond to the claimed Morder filter. However the claim does not differentiate the Morder filter from the position control part 3 of Yamamoto.